arXiv:1404.6958v1 [cond-mat.stat-mech] 18 Apr 2014

Bulk induced phase transition in driven diffusive systems

Yu-Qing Wang[1], Rui Jiang[1],* Anatoly B Kolomeisky[2], and Mao-Bin Hu[1]
[1] *State Key Laboratory of Fire Science and School of Engineering Science, University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei 230026, China and*
[2] *Department of Chemistry, Rice University, Houston, TX 77005-1892, USA*

(Dated: April 29, 2014)

This Letter studies a weakly and asymmetrically coupled three-lane driven diffusive system. A non-monotonically changing density profile in the middle lane has been observed. When the extreme value of the density profile reaches $\rho = 0.5$, a bulk induced phase transition occurs which exhibits a shock and a continuously and smoothly decreasing density profile which crosses $\rho = 0.5$ upstream or downstream of the shock. The existence of double shocks has also been observed. A mean-field approach has been used to interpret the numerical results obtained by Monte Carlo simulations. The current minimization principle has excluded the occurrence of two or more bulk induced shocks in the general case of nonzero lane changing rates.

PACS numbers: 05.70.Ln, 02.50.Ey, 05.60.Cd

Introduction. Driven diffusive system is a rewarding research topic in recent decades, which exhibits non-vanishing current even in the steady state and has served as fruitful testing grounds for fundamental research in non-equilibrium physics [1-5]. The driven diffusive systems exhibit many surprising or counterintuitive features, given our experiences with equilibrium systems, e.g., spontaneous symmetry breaking, phase separation, etc. [6-10].

The boundary induced phase transition is another non-equilibrium phenomenon [11-14]. For the case of vanishing right boundary density, Krug postulated a rather general maximal-current principle that the system tries to maximize its stationary current [11]. The maximal-current principle has later been generalized to the extremal current principle [12,13]

$$j = \begin{cases} \max & j(\rho) \quad \text{for } \rho_- > \rho_+ \\ \min & j(\rho) \quad \text{for } \rho_- < \rho_+ \end{cases} \tag{1}$$

Here ρ_- (ρ_+) is the constant effective density of the left (right) reservoir from which particles are flowing into (out of) the system. The microscopic details of the system only determine the functional form of the current $j(\rho)$ and the effective boundary densities.

Motivated by facts such as the unidirectional motion of many motor proteins along cytoskeletal filaments, in which motors advance along the filament while attachment and detachment of motors between the cytoplasm and the filament occur, the constraint of the conserved dynamics in the bulk in the driven diffusive system has been relaxed to consider random particle attachments and detachments in the bulk [15]. The resulting dynamics leads to a phase coexistence of low and high density regions separated by a shock.

The driven diffusive systems have also been extended to include the possibility of transport on multiple parallel lanes to describe phenomena such as the extraction of membrane tubes by molecular motors, macroscopic clustering phenomena, car traffic and so on (see e.g. Refs.[16-29] and references therein), in which the boundary induced phase transitions still could be observed.



FIG. 1: Sketch of the three-lane TASEP. The arrow shows allowed hopping and the cross shows prohibited hopping.

Model and mean field equations. This Letters studies a weakly and asymmetrically coupled three-lane totally asymmetric simple exclusion process (TASEP), and reports a bulk induced phase transition. Our model is defined in a three-lane lattice of $N \times 3$ sites, where N is the length of a lane (see Fig.1). For each time step, a site is chosen at random. A particle at site i and lane j can jump with rate 1 to site $i+1$ if it is unoccupied. Otherwise, if site $i+1$ is occupied, the particle jumps to site i on lane $j+1$ with rate ω_A and to site i on lane $j-1$ with rate ω_B ($\omega_B \neq \omega_A$), provided the target site is unoccupied. Obviously, $\omega_B = 0$ for lane 1 and $\omega_A = 0$ for lane 3. The asymmetric coupling makes the the middle lane different from two other lanes, and bulk induced phase transition occurs on this lane. At the boundaries, a particle enters from the left boundary with rate α, and is removed from the right boundary with rate β. As in previous studies, a weakly coupling is considered in which $\omega_A N = \Omega_A$ and $\omega_B N = \Omega_B$ are kept constant.

The hydrodynamic mean field equations of the system

*Electronic address: rjiang@ustc.edu.cn

could be written as

$$\frac{\partial \rho_1}{\partial t} = -(1-2\rho_1)\frac{\partial \rho_1}{\partial x} - \Omega_A \rho_1^2(1-\rho_2) + \Omega_B \rho_2^2(1-\rho_1) \quad (2)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \rho_2}{\partial t} &= -(1-2\rho_2)\frac{\partial \rho_2}{\partial x} - \Omega_A \rho_2^2(1-\rho_3) + \Omega_B \rho_3^2(1-\rho_2) \\ &\quad -\Omega_B \rho_2^2(1-\rho_1) + \Omega_A \rho_1^2(1-\rho_2) \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

$$\frac{\partial \rho_3}{\partial t} = -(1-2\rho_3)\frac{\partial \rho_3}{\partial x} - \Omega_B \rho_3^2(1-\rho_2) + \Omega_A \rho_2^2(1-\rho_3) \quad (4)$$

In the steady state, one has

$$(1-2\rho_1)\frac{d\rho_1}{dx} = -\Omega_A \rho_1^2(1-\rho_2) + \Omega_B \rho_2^2(1-\rho_1) \quad (5)$$

$$\begin{aligned} (1-2\rho_2)\frac{d\rho_2}{dx} &= -\Omega_A \rho_2^2(1-\rho_3) + \Omega_B \rho_3^2(1-\rho_2) \\ &\quad -\Omega_B \rho_2^2(1-\rho_1) + \Omega_A \rho_1^2(1-\rho_2) \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

$$(1-2\rho_3)\frac{d\rho_3}{dx} = -\Omega_B \rho_3^2(1-\rho_2) + \Omega_A \rho_2^2(1-\rho_3) \quad (7)$$

Here ρ_i denotes the density on lane i. Via rescaling the total length to unity, the boundary conditions $\rho_i(0) = \min(\alpha, 1/2)$ and $\rho_i(1) = \max(1-\beta, 1/2)$ should be imposed properly, depending on the specific state of the system. Via numerical solving Eqs.(5)-(7), we can obtain the density profile of the three lanes.

Results. Figure 2 shows a typical phase diagram of a three-lane system, in which an asymmetrical set of parameters $\Omega_A = 10$ and $\Omega_B = 0.1$ is adopted. In the phase diagram, XYZ stands for the state of the three lanes. L (H) means that the corresponding lane i is in low (high) density phase $\rho_i < 0.5 (\rho_i > 0.5)$, S means that there is a shock on the lane (shocks S_1 and S_2 denote bulk induced shocks as discussed below), D means that there are two shocks on the lane, C means that the density profile is a Continuously and Smoothly Decreasing one and Crosses $\rho = 0.5$ (CSDC). The transitions among LLL, LLS, LSS, LLH, LSH, LHH, SSH, SHH, HHH can be easily understood as boundary induced phase transitions, see e.g., Refs.[19,20]. For instance, when $\rho_3(1)$ increases to β in the LLL phase, a shock is induced from the right boundary on lane 3 and thus the LLL phase transits into LLS phase. Fig.3 shows the typical density profiles of these states.

We focus on the density profiles in the LLS state. Fig.4(a) shows several typical density profiles with the fixed value $\beta = 0.276$. Note that in the LLS state, due to existence of a shock on the third lane, the density profile is not smooth in the middle lane at the shock location, which separates the density profile into two parts. When α is left to the dotted line in the phase diagram, the density profile in the downstream part is increasing with x. With the increase of α, the shock moves left, so that the downstream part expands. Across the dotted line,



FIG. 2: Phase diagram of the three lane TASEP obtained from mean field calculation. The parameters $\Omega_A = 10$ and $\Omega_B = 0.1$. Details about the dotted lines and the dashed lines 1-5 are in the text.

the density profile in the downstream part becomes non-monotonically changing. This is because $J_{1\to 2} - J_{2\to 1}$ begins to change sign with x in the downstream part. Here $J_{i\to j}$ means flow from lane i to lane j. In the LLH state, the shock has been expelled out from the left end, and the density profile is always monotonically changing. On the boundary between LLH and LS_1H, the extreme value of the density profile on lane 2 reached $\rho = 0.5$. As a result, a bulk induced phase transition occurs, which exhibits a shock (S_1) as well as a CSDC density profile downstream of the shock. Note that when $\rho_2 = 0.5$, the coefficient $(1-2\rho_2)$ of Eq.(6) equals zero. Consequently, the mean field equations (5)-(7) cannot be used to solve the CSDC density profile in the vicinity of $\rho_2 = 0.5$, because the numerical solution diverges. We have used Eqs.(2)-(4) instead. Similarly, in the SHH state, the density profile located in the upstream part of the middle lane gradually becomes non-monotonically changing when (α, β) approaches the corresponding dotted line. Across the boundary between LHH and LS_2H, a bulk induced shock (S_2) as well as a CSDC density profile upstream of the shock appears, see Fig.4(b).

Next we interpret why only one bulk induced shock is triggered. Suppose there are two bulk induced shock. As a result, the density profile crosses $\rho = 0.5$ twice, i.e., there are two locations x_1 and x_2 $(x_1 < x_2)$ at which $\rho_2 = 0.5$. Therefore, we have the following equation at the two locations according to the current conservation



FIG. 3: (color online) Typical density profiles in state (a) LLL, (b) LLS, (c) LSS, (d) LLH, (e) LSH, (f) LHH, (g) SSH, (h) SHH, (i) HHH. The solid lines are simulation results, and the dashed lines are mean field results. $(\alpha, \beta) =$ (0.1, 0.25), (0.1, 0.15), (0.074, 0.087), (0.268, 0.286), (0.2, 0.18), (0.278, 0.166), (0.15, 0.098), (0.45, 0.11), (0.45, 0.09) in (a)-(i), respectively. In the simulation, the system size $N = 20000$.



FIG. 4: (color online) The density profiles of the middle lane (mean field results). (a) System transits from LLS to LS_1H. Parameters are $\beta = 0.276$, $\alpha = 0.14, 0.15, 0.163, 0.17, 0.229, 0.29, 0.308$ for curves from bottom to top. (b) System transits from SHH to LS_2H. Parameters are $\alpha = 0.310$, $\beta = 0.088, 0.098, 0.108, 0.128, 0.152, 0.189, 0.206$ for curves from top to bottom.



FIG. 5: (color online) The density profiles of the middle lane (mean field results). (a) System transits from LS_1H to LCH. The parameter $\beta = 0.296$. (b) System transits from LS_2H to LCH. The parameter $\alpha = 0.358$.



FIG. 6: (color online) The density profiles of the middle lane (mean field results). (a) shows the transition from LSH to LDH along dashed line 1. Parameters are $(\alpha, \beta) =$ (0.154, 0.173), (0.178, 0.180), (0.190, 0.184), (0.211, 0.190), (0.241, 0.198) and (0.268, 0.206) for curves from bottom to top at $x = 0$. (b) shows the transition along dashed line 2. Parameters are $(\alpha, \beta) =$ (0.182, 0.128), (0.200, 0.145), (0.218, 0.161), (0.234, 0.175) and (0.268, 0.206) for curves from from top to bottom at $x = 1$. (c) shows the transition from LS_1H to LDH along dashed line 3. The parameter $\alpha = 0.305$. (d) shows the transition from LS_2H to LDH along dashed line 4. The parameter $\alpha = 0.318$.

principle

$$\rho_1(1-\rho_1) + \rho_3(1-\rho_3) = c, \tag{8}$$

where $0 < c \leq 0.5$ stands for a constant.

Substituting $\rho_2 = 0.5$ into Eq.(6), we have

$$-\Omega_A(1-\rho_3) + 2\Omega_B\rho_3^2 - \Omega_B(1-\rho_1) + 2\Omega_A\rho_1^2 = 0 \tag{9}$$

at locations x_1 and x_2. Suppose $\Omega_A > \Omega_B$, then one has $\rho_1 < 0.5$ and $\rho_3 > 0.5$ at the two locations. Thus, from Eq.(8), ρ_3 can be solved

$$\rho_3 = \frac{1 + \sqrt{1 - 4[c - \rho_1(1-\rho_1)]}}{2} \tag{10}$$



FIG. 7: (color online) The density profiles of the middle lane (mean field results). System transits from LDH state to LCH state along dashed line 5.

Substituting Eq.(10) into (9), one has

$$\begin{aligned} f(\rho_1) \equiv & -\Omega_A\left\{1-\frac{1+\sqrt{1-4[c-\rho_1(1-\rho_1)]}}{2}\right\} \\ & +2\Omega_B\left\{\frac{1+\sqrt{1-4[c-\rho_1(1-\rho_1)]}}{2}\right\}^2 \\ & -\Omega_B(1-\rho_1)+2\Omega_A\rho_1^2 \\ & =0 \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

Taking derivative to ρ_1, we obtain

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial \rho_1}=\frac{(1-2\rho_1)\left[\Omega_A+2\Omega_B(1+d)\right]}{d}+4\Omega_A\rho_1+\Omega_B \tag{12}$$

where $d=\sqrt{1-4\left[c-\rho_1(1-\rho_1)\right]}$. Since $\rho_1<0.5$, $\partial f/\partial\rho_1>0$ is always satisfied. This means that Eq.(11) has at most one solution. Therefore, $\rho_1(x_1)=\rho_1(x_2)$ and $\rho_3(x_1)=\rho_3(x_2)$. When one lane-changing parameter equals 0, both $\rho_1(x)$ and $\rho_3(x)$ are monotonically changing with x. Therefore, $\rho_1(x_1)=\rho_1(x_2)$ and $\rho_3(x_1)=\rho_3(x_2)$ cannot be satisfied.

In the general situation that neither Ω_A nor Ω_B equal to 0, the section $x\le x_1$ and the section $x\ge x_2$ can match each other and constitute a shortened system with length $1-(x_2-x_1)$, in which only one bulk induced shock exists. The mean-field analysis has shown that given the same value of α and β, the flow rate in a shortened system is larger than that in the original system, provided there exists one bulk induced shock in both systems. Thus, we argue that the current minimization principle excludes the occurrence of two or more bulk induced shocks.

We study the density profiles in the LS_1H state. Fig.5(a) shows several density profiles with $\beta=0.296$ is fixed. With the increase of α, the shock gradually moves left. Across the boundary between LS_1H and LCH, the shock is expelled out from the left end, and only the CSDC density profile is left in the middle lane. Similarly, the shock is expelled out from the right end in the LS_2H phase when across the boundary between LS_2H and LCH, see Fig.5(b).

Figs.6 (a) and (b) show the density profiles in the LSH phase, in which (α,β) changes along dashed lines 1 and 2 in the phase diagram, respectively. When (α,β) is left of the dotted line, the density profile is increasing both upstream and downstream of the shock. However, when across the dotted line, the density profile becomes non-monotonic upstream (downstream) of the shock. On the boundary between LSH and LDH, the maximum (minimum) of density profile reaches $\rho=0.5$. When across the boundary, the bulk induced shock appears upstream (downstream) of the first shock and thus two shocks exist simultaneously in the middle lane.

Figs.6(c) and (d) show the density profiles in the LS_1H and LS_2H phase, in which (α,β) changes along dashed lines 3 and 4, respectively. On approaching the boundary between LS_1H (LS_2H) and LDH , $\rho_2(1)$ ($\rho_2(0)$) gradually approaches β ($(1-\alpha)$). Across the boundary, a shock is induced from the right (left) boundary, thus, double shocks emerge.

Finally, in the LDH phase, when (α,β) changes along dashed line 5, the left shock moves toward left and the right shock moves right. On the boundary between the LDH phase and the LCH phase, the two shocks are expelled from the system, simultaneously, see Fig.7.

Discussion. Hinsch and Frey have studied a periodic one-dimensional exclusion process composed of a driven and a diffusive part, and identified bulk-driven phase transitions in a mesoscopic limit where both dynamics compete [30]. Nevertheless, the system can be regarded as two sub-systems connecting together. Therefore, the bulk-driven phase transitions are essentially boundary induced ones.

In our system, we can also treat the location where the CSDC density profile crosses $\rho=0.5$ as a virtual boundary, which separates the system into two sub-systems. For the left sub-system, the effective exit rate for the middle lane is $\beta_{2,eff}=0.5$. For the right one, the effective entrance rate for the middle lane is $\alpha_{2,eff}=0.5$. Nevertheless, instead of a static boundary, the location of the virtual boundary in our system is self-tuned and determined by the values of the kinetic rates.

We also would like to point out that the existence of double shocks has been demonstrated when considering detachment and attachment of particles in the Katz-Lebowitz-Spohn process [31]. However, different from the double shocks in LDH state in our model, both shocks are boundary induced ones in Ref.[31].

Conclusion. To summarize, we have studied a weakly and asymmetrically coupled three-lane TASEP. The phase diagram has been presented. A non-monotonically changing density profile in the middle lane has been observed in the LLH, LHH, LSH phases. When the extreme value of the density profile reaches $\rho=0.5$, a bulk induced phase transition occurs which exhibits a

shock and a CSDC density profile upstream or downstream of the shock. In particular, the CSDC density profile has not been observed before. The double shocks comprising of one bulk induced shock and one boundary induced shock has also been observed. In the situation that one of the lane changing rates equals zero, it can be easily proved that there cannot exist two bulk induced shocks. In the general case where both lane changing rates are nonzeros, the current minimization principle has excluded the occurrence of two or more bulk induced shocks.

This paper only focuses on the three-lane TASEP. When the number of lanes further increases, the phase diagram will become much more complicated. The questions such as whether two or more bulk induced shocks could be observed simultaneously in a lane, whether bulk induced shocks can be observed simultaneously in different lanes, need to be investigated in the future work.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work is funded by the National Basic Research Program of China (No.2012CB725404), the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant Nos. 71371175 and 71171185).

[1] B. Schmittmann, R.K.P. Zia, Phys. Rep. **301**, 45 (1998).
[2] B. Derrida, Phys. Rep. **301**, 65 (1998).
[3] G. M. Schütz, in *Phase Transitions and Critical Phenomena*, edited by C. Domb and J. Lebowitz (Academic, London, 2000), vol. 19.
[4] R. A. Blythe, M. R. Evans, J. Phys. A **46**, R333 (2007)
[5] T. Chou, K. Mallick and R. K. P. Zia, Rep. Prog. Phys. **74**, 116601 (2011)
[6] M. R. Evans, D. P. Foster, C. Godreche and D. Mukamel, Phys. Rev. Lett. **74**, 208 (1995); J. Stat. Phys. **80**, 69 (1995).
[7] M. R. Evans, Y. Kafri, H. M. Koduvely, and D. Mukamel, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 425 (1998).
[8] Y. Kafri, E. Levine, D. Mukamel, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 035702 (2002).
[9] Arndt, P.F., Heinzel, T., Rittenberg, V.: J. Stat. Phys. 90, 783 (1998); Rajewsky, N., Sasamoto, T., Speer, E.R.: Physica A 279, 123 (2000)
[10] Adams, D.A., Schmittmann, B., Zia, R.K.P.: Phys. Rev. E 75, 041123 (2007); Korniss, G., Schmittmann, B., Zia, R.K.P.: Europhys. Lett. 45, 431 (1999); Mettetal, J.T., Schmittmann, B., Zia, R.K.P.: Europhys. Lett. 58, 653 (2002)
[11] J. Krug, Phys. Rev. Lett. **67**, 1882 (1991).
[12] V. Popkov and G. M. Schütz, Europhys. Lett. 48, 257 (1999).
[13] A. B. Kolomeisky, G. M. Schütz, E. B. Kolomeisky, and J. P. Straley, J. Phys. A 31, 6911 (1998)
[14] J. S. Hager, J. Krug, V. Popkov, and G. M. Schütz. Phys. Rev. E **63**, 056110 (2001).
[15] A. Parmeggiani, T. Franosch, E. Frey, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 086601 (2003); Phys. Rev. E 70 046101 (2004).
[16] M. R. Evans, Y. Kafri, K. E. P. Sugden, J. Tailleur, J. Stat. Mech. P06009 (2011).
[17] R. J. Harris, R. B. Stinchcombe, Physica A **354**, 582 (2005).
[18] T. Reichenbach, T. Franosch, E. Frey, Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 050603 (2006).
[19] R. Juhász, Phys. Rev. E **76**, 021117 (2007); J. Stat. Mech. P03010 (2010).
[20] R. Jiang, M. B. Hu, Y. H. Wu, Q. S. Wu, Phys. Rev. E **77**, 041128 (2008).
[21] R. Jiang, K. Nishinari, M. B. Hu, Y. H. Wu, and Q. S. Wu, J. Stat. Phys. **136**, 73 (2009).
[22] Z. P. Cai, Y. M. Yuan, R. Jiang et al., J. Stat. Mech. P07016 (2008).
[23] K. Tsekouras, A. B. Kolomeisky, J. Phys. A **41**, 095002 (2008); **41**, 465001 (2008); E. Pronina and A. B. Kolomeisky, J. Phys. A **37**, 9907 (2004).
[24] V. Popkov, I. Peschel, Phys. Rev. E **64**, 026126 (2001); V.Popkov, M.Salerno, Phys. Rev. E **83**, 011130 (2011).
[25] I. T. Georgiev, B. Schmittmann, R. K. P. Zia, Phys. Rev. Lett. **94**, 115701 (2005).
[26] A. Melbinger, T. Reichenbach, T. Franosch, and E. Frey, Phys. Rev. E **83**, 031923 (2011).
[27] C. Schikmann, C. Appert-Rolland, and L. Santen, J. Stat. Mech. P06002 (2010).
[28] Q. H. Shi, R. Jiang, M. B. Hu, Q. S. Wu, J.Stat.Phys. **142**, 616 (2011).
[29] T. Ezaki and K. Nishinari, Phys. Rev. E **84**, 061141 (2011).
[30] H. Hinsch and E. Frey, Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 095701 (2006).
[31] V. Popkov, A. Rakos, R. D. Willmann, A. B. Kolomeisky, and G. Schütz, Phys. Rev. E 67, 066117 (2003).